

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The amendments set out above and the following remarks are responsive to the points raised by the Office Action dated February 20, 2008. In view of the amendments set out above and the following remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Pending Claims

Claims 11-16 are added, and claims 2-3 are cancelled, so that claims 1 and 4-16 are pending. Claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of formerly pending claim 3. No new matter has been added, and the basis for the amended claim language may be found within the original specification, claims, and drawings.

Claim 1 is supported by, for example, original claim 3. Claim 11 is supported by, for example, original claim 1, and at page 7, lines 1-2; page 7, line 8; and page 7, line 22 to page 8, line 3. Claim 12 is supported at, for example, page 9, lines 5-7. Claim 13 is supported at, for example, page 9, lines 8-10. Claim 14 is supported at, for example, page 13, lines 12-15. Claim 15 is supported at, for example, page 13, lines 16-20. Claim 16 is supported at, for example, page 13, lines 21-26.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. According to the Office Action, the bracketed characters within parentheses are unclear as to what the applicant intends to include in the claims.

Claim 1 is amended to delete the parentheses and the brackets. It is respectfully submitted that with these amendments to the claims, the indefiniteness rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 6-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,403,690 to Komori et al. (hereinafter, "Komori").

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0097621 to Macdonald et al. (hereinafter, "Macdonald").

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by JP 2001-122977 (hereinafter, "JP '977"), JP 2001-294759 (hereinafter, "JP '759"), and JP 2001-316543 (hereinafter, "JP '543").

Each of these rejections is separately and respectfully traversed.

However, in order to expedite matters and allow the application to pass to issuance quickly, claim 1 is amended to include the limitations of formerly pending claim 3, which was not rejected over any prior art reference. Thus, each of the outstanding rejections has been obviated.

New independent claim 11 defines a flame-retardant synthetic resin composition comprising, *inter alia*, an organic phosphorous compound represented by the general formula (1), wherein R^1 represents unsubstituted aralkyl or a group represented by the general formula (2), wherein R^2 represents C1-10 alkyl or substituted or unsubstituted aryl, wherein the synthetic resin is one or more selected from the group consisting of polyester resins, polyurethane resins, polycarbonate resins and epoxy resins.


None of the cited references disclose a flame-retardant synthetic resin composition comprising, *inter alia*, an organic phosphorous compound represented by the general formula (1), wherein R^1 represents unsubstituted aralkyl or a group represented by the general formula (2), wherein R^2 represents C1-10 alkyl or substituted or unsubstituted aryl, wherein the synthetic resin is one or more selected from the group consisting of polyester resins, polyurethane resins, polycarbonate resins and epoxy resins. Because none of the cited references discloses all of the limitations of new independent claim 11, new claim 11 is also patentable over the cited references.

Because the independent claims are patentable for the reasons set forth above, the dependent claims are also patentable because they depend from patentable independent claims.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephanie M. Lawley, Reg. No. ~~65~~362
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-3960
(202) 737-6770 (telephone)
(202) 737-6776 (facsimile)

Date: May 15, 2008

SML/mlg